

On *Hydroecia burrowsi*, n. sp. (With Plate.)

By T. A. CHAPMAN, M.D.

Mr. Burrows has recently given us, in the *Transactions of the Entomological Society*,\* a complete account of his researches so far in the *nictitans* group of the genus *Hydroecia*. He had at various times told us something about them before, but now we have the results of his work clearly set forth.

I had the pleasure of supplying him with various examples of this group from a good many localities, and amongst some Asiatic examples he found a species he had not previously met with, and which he has named *asiatica*: of this he only found one example. I have since obtained Asiatic material from Staudinger and others, and amongst these some eight or ten more *asiatica* turned up, all of them labelled Juldus Kuldscha, a locality different from that of the first specimen, but no example was found amongst "*nictitans*" from any other locality. The great mass of the specimens belonged to one species which I will call *paludis*, though Mr. Burrows has not yet condescended to name it. I thus obviously run the risks that befall those that "rush in where, etc." I have no authority to quote Mr. Burrows on this matter, but I believe he is still investigating the relations (if any) between *lucens* and *paludis* in Britain, and till he has satisfied himself on various points, will not commit himself as to non-British forms. My own opinion, which must be taken as very provisional, is that these two forms are distinct species in Britain, but that these Asiatic specimens are not too distinctly the one or the other. However, I do not profess to have, nor desire to express, any decided opinion as to these being *paludis*, I only want provisionally to use a name for these forms, my only present concern is with *H. burrowsi*.

The genitalia of all the forms differentiated by Mr. Burrows are most abundantly distinct, *asiatica* might indeed belong to a different genus, and only *lucens* and *paludis* at all closely resemble each other.

Amongst those *paludis* received from Staudinger was one very large specimen from Vladivostock, which, on examination of the appendages, turns out to be a new and very distinct form. Not only is the specimen itself large, but the appendages also are very large and bold. Unfortunately there is only the one specimen. Another, looking very like it and about as large, from Manchuria, is only *paludis*.

I propose to gratify my regard for Mr. Burrows and to honour him for his work on this group by naming this fine form *burrowsi*.

*Hydroecia burrowsi*, n.sp. The specimen is very large, 39mm. amongst all the Asiatic specimens (*paludis*) few approach it, one from Manchuria 37mm., and one or two labelled Amur nearly the same, but the majority are only 32-34 mm. in expanse. In colour it is a deep rich red-brown, with brighter red stigmata, a coloration quite the same as several of the *paludis*. We may expect that a series would shew variations of colour similar to those in the other species of this group of the genus *Hydroecia*.

In markings there is one difference from the *paludis*. Beyond the stigmata are two nearly parallel lines, and the space between the outer one and the margin is divided into two by an angulated line. In

\*1911, p. 738.